

HOME

RESOURCES

VIDEOS

BLOGS

BOOK REVIEWS

INTERNATIONAL

CONFERENCES

NETWORK

THE GOSPEL-DRIVEN CHURCH

Gospel-Centered for the Cause of Gospel Wakefulness

JARED C. WILSON

 **BLOGS**

JARED C. WILSON | 9:00 AM CT

The Polluted Waters of *50 Shades of Grey*, Etc.

JUL
13
2012

[TRIGGER WARNING]: The content of this post (and resulting comments) contains language and imagery that may be sensitive or harmful to victims of sexual abuse or rape.

Edit: This post has received a lot of attention. From a lot of people. I hope they will also read [this follow-up](#), in which I attempt to clarify that neither I nor Douglas Wilson as I understand him are advocating any sort of violence, abuse, or manipulation of women. The charge is heavy and the thought is unconscionable. But it appears necessary to clarify, and so I have.

This passage from Douglas Wilson's book [Fidelity: What it Means to be a One-Woman Man](#) was written 13 years ago, but I found it especially relevant in the wake of the success of *50 Shades of Grey* and other modern celebrations of perverted sexual authority/submission. It is found in the chapter in the book on Rape, and Wilson argues that this sort of sexual pathology is a perverted version of good, God-honoring, and body-protecting authority and submission between husbands and wives.

A final aspect of rape that should be briefly mentioned is perhaps closer to home. Because we have forgotten the biblical concepts of true authority and submission, or more accurately, have rebelled against them, we have created a climate in which caricatures of authority and submission intrude upon our lives with violence.

When we quarrel with the way the world *is*, we find that the world has ways of getting back at us. In other words, however we try, the sexual act cannot be made into an egalitarian pleasuring party. A man penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants. A woman receives, surrenders, accepts. This is of course offensive to all egalitarians, and so our culture has rebelled against the concept of authority and submission in marriage. This means that we have sought to suppress the concepts of authority and submission as they relate to the marriage bed.

But we cannot make gravity disappear just because we dislike it, and in the same way we find that our banished authority and submission comes back to us in pathological forms. This is what lies behind sexual "bondage and submission games," along with very common rape fantasies. Men dream of being rapists, and women find themselves wistfully reading novels in which someone ravishes the "soon to be made willing" heroine. Those who deny they have any need for water at all will soon find themselves lusting after polluted water, but water nonetheless.

True authority and true submission are therefore an erotic necessity. When authority is honored according to the word of God it serves and protects — and gives enormous pleasure. When it is denied, the result is not "no authority," but an authority which devours.

– Douglas Wilson, *Fidelity: What it Means to be a One-Woman Man* (Moscow, Idaho: Canon Press, 1999), 86-87.

Update: Please read [the follow-up](#) to this post.

ABOUT JARED



I'm the husband of Becky, the father of Macy and Grace, a writer of books, and the pastor of a great church. Most importantly, I am a follower of Jesus. [More...](#)

 [Subscribe via Feed](#)
 [Subscribe via Email](#)
 [Follow on Twitter](#)

BOOKS



Gospel Wakefulness

by Jared C. Wilson, Foreword by Raymond C. Ortlund Jr.



Your Jesus Is Too Safe

Outgrowing a Drive-Thru, Feel-Good Savior

by Jared C. Wilson



Abide

by Jared C. Wilson



Seven Daily Sins

How the Gospel Redeems Our Deepest Desires

by Jared C. Wilson



Gospel Deepes

Reveling in the Excellencies of Jesus (Forthcoming)

by Jared C. Wilson

ARCHIVES

[July 2012](#)
[June 2012](#)
[May 2012](#)
[April 2012](#)
[March 2012](#)
[February 2012](#)
[January 2012](#)
[December 2011](#)
[November 2011](#)
[October 2011](#)
[September 2011](#)
[August 2011](#)
[July 2011](#)
[June 2011](#)
[May 2011](#)
[April 2011](#)
[March 2011](#)
[February 2011](#)
[January 2011](#)
[December 2010](#)



125 Comments



Wesley

July 13, 2012 at 11:21 am

This is really a disturbing truth Wilson presents here. When will we at last remember that our theological decisions have consequences (for good or ill) in our everyday lives. We have to see the opposite side of our decisions clearly or we will proceed blindly into destruction. It is not less damaging than willful, eyes-wide-open sin; only more pitiful. I speak to some of this same trajectory as it relates to marriage and our choice of partner here <http://outin2thedeepest.wordpress.com/2012/07/11/unequally-yoked-broadening-our-biblical-perspective/>
God help us. Thanks so much for posting this Jared.



Pam

July 13, 2012 at 11:29 pm

This isn't a 'truth'. It's the ravings of a misogynist who has no care or concern for women. He also clearly doesn't know or care that there are male rape victims, too.



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 10:37 am

Pam, have you read *Fidelity.* If you had, you'd know Wilson's care for women is profound. The entire book is about how men are designed to protect and lead women with tenderness.



Pam

July 16, 2012 at 1:04 am

I've read the rape chapter and was horrified to the point of almost being in tears. There was not one iota of compassion in the words there. I will not subject myself to reading more of a man who sees fit to tell women that their rapes are 'God's judgement'.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 9:08 am

He actually doesn't say "to women" that rapes are God's judgment. He says to intended male readers that that rape is judgment upon *a culture* that does not cherish and protect women. It's a controversial point and a niggling one, but he also specifically says that rape is not a specific judgment upon the victim for any sin. I'll find the exact quote later and post it if needed.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 3:57 pm

The pertinent passage is on pg. 82 of my edition of the book. Wilson plainly and clearly says that the victim of rape should not assume any personal responsibility for it and that she is — in his words — "innocent."

Again, he is saying that the prevalence of rape is an aspect of God's judgment upon a culture/society that fails to cherish and protect women. He bases this assertion in Scriptures like **Zech. 14:2** and **Job 31:9** and **Eccl. 8:11**.



Pam

July 17, 2012 at 12:20 am

Jared, do you think a rape victim is going to feel better because Doug describes their rape as a general societal judgement rather than a specific personal one? I don't think that's going to be of any comfort.
The other thing that comes through in the chapter is a complete lack of female agency. Things happen to women, women don't do things. Women are completely passive. That's outdated and insulting. My gender doesn't restrict my ability to make decisions or be engaged in my own life, and I'm saddened to see Christians promote such incorrect ideas.



scottie

July 13, 2012 at 11:29 pm

So, you are saying that I should be happy and willing to be penetrated and conquered by my husband, regardless?

Anything less would be sin?

Please clarify.



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 10:39 am

No, I'm not saying that, and neither is Doug Wilson, the author of the quote.

He's saying "penetration" and "conquering" are ways to describe the physical act of intercourse. That people turn these into violence and un-gentleness and power/ego trips is sinful perversion. Nowhere in this quote or in the book elsewhere does he say that wives should be happy to be dominated or happy to have intercourse "regardless." In fact he teaches the biblical instructions on mutual submission as it relates to marital sexuality.

November 2010

October 2010

September 2010

August 2010

July 2010

June 2010

May 2010

April 2010

March 2010

February 2010

January 2010

December 2009

November 2009

October 2009

September 2009

August 2009

July 2009

June 2009

May 2009

April 2009

March 2009

February 2009

January 2009

December 2008

November 2008

October 2008

September 2008

August 2008

July 2008

June 2008

May 2008

April 2008

March 2008

February 2008

January 2008

December 2007

November 2007

October 2007

September 2007

August 2007

 scottie

July 14, 2012 at 12:50 pm

Jared,

The information you provide in your post — your comments & the excerpt from the book — does nothing but imply all sorts of disturbing things. The sort that would make any reasonable person who is not steeped in these ideas feel quite ill.

Given that this will be read by people of various convictions & degrees of awareness of Doug Wilson's (& your own) ideas — people of various experiences which will include scars of sexual violence — it seems to me that clarification WITHIN THE POST is most required.

That is, if you have a care for what the effect your words has on people. As well as not being misunderstood on something as sickening as what you have implied.

That provokes more questions

 Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 1:05 pm

Scottie, what sickening thing have I implied?

To find what is written sickening the way *you* are implying it is, you have to read it terribly uncharitably. Re-read the last paragraph. Wilson is promoting sexuality that “serves and protects” and speaks against that which “devours.” The entire book does the same.

I'm not even sure what you think the post is promoting? The entire chapter it's from is about the sin of rape and this quote is *against* the way mainstream culture has created “rape fantasies.” Why would you be against someone who is against sexual abuse?

 scottie

July 14, 2012 at 4:20 pm

Jared,

I'm trying to respond in kind, with a true attempt at understanding and clear thought (a little challenging with numerous pesty distractions at the moment).

I re-read everything. I did pick up on:

—“good, God-honoring, and body-protecting...” ,

—“...authority is honored according to the word of God it serves and protects — and gives enormous pleasure.”

—a general opposition to violence

These are certainly good things. So, to some extent I can see that I have misunderstood. However, the greater point is not all that fleshed out, and leaves ample room for all kinds of mental pictures.

The fact of the matter is that it is simply most uncomfortable (with a sense of nausea) to reduce sexual intimacy down to penetrating and being the penetrated. This will surely more so be the case for your readers who are reduced to being identified as “the penetrated ones”. There is nothing but extreme discomfort (understatement) at the notion of being “penetrated” in this context. And although it may not be the intent, it all comes across as starkly invasive. Nausea is really starting now.

I am greatly slowing down what the experience of reading your post is like, & then putting it into words.

So, we have the clinical penetrating and being penetrated, and these are combined with words like conquer and surrender. Indeed, surrender is not an option when one is being conquered. It is forced. Another layer to all this is comparing “conquer” with authority, and “surrender” with submission, which are described as appropriately existing in the marriage bed where they belong. Throw in the concept that authority and submission are “God-honoring”. A picture begins to emerge that what is God-honoring is for the woman to accept the fact that the way things are is the way things are, so lay back and submissively be conquered & receive the penetrating. Objecting or resisting for any reason is not part of the imagery.

It is true that “authority” is qualified by words like serve and protect, but these qualifers are not developed in the context. They do little to mitigate the powerful imagery that in order for a woman to be God-honoring she must submit to the man's authority in the sexual realm and take what's coming, regardless of how godly the man believes himself to be.

I don't know how well I've crystallized my thoughts here, but not for lack of trying. All in all, it is very hard to imagine a woman reading your post and not being repulsed and sickened. This is surely not what you would want.

 Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 4:27 pm

Scottie, I don't know how to respond to you without risking further offense.

Penetration is part of sexual intercourse. It is not sick in and of itself. The “conquering” Wilson is referring to, both in the context of this excerpt, and in the wider context of the book’s chapter and book, is not an abusive, against-the-will action. Paired with “serving and protecting” it is a (narrow) picture of what happens in sexual intercourse. In the context of, say, the Song of Solomon, for instance, it makes good biblical sense.

You have to read into the post to find Wilson endorsing “take what’s coming” or anything near to abuse or forcefulness. This is not warranted even in the excerpt.

I agree that if you define the words mentioned according to the meanings Wilson is *not* using or implying and is actually speaking *against,* his words are offensive. But of course he is not defining those words that way and is speaking against the very thing you are concerned about.

I trust that even my more sensitive readers, particularly ones who’ve read me for a while, will be thoughtful and careful enough in their reading to know I would not post an endorsement of abuse, force, or submission to either abuse or force. It is not hard for me to imagine a woman who’s a careful reader not being sickened in the least.



Garland

July 14, 2012 at 4:39 am

What a pervert. As if his repulsive and false teachings on slavery weren’t enough. “But now I am writing you that you must not associate with anyone who calls himself a brother but is sexually immoral or greedy, an idolater or a slanderer, a drunkard or a swindler. With such a man do not even eat.” -1 Corinthians 5:11
I formally refuse fellowship with Doug Wilson and denounce his teaching until he should repent, and hope that others will do likewise. How dare you endorse his teaching?



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 10:40 am

Garland, please don’t bear false witness in my blog comments.

I “dare” endorse his teaching on the matter quoted in the blog post because it is sound and compelling. I believe you speak out of ignorance or confusion.



Garland

July 14, 2012 at 6:53 pm

I would ask that you clarify your accusation of false witness. Douglas Wilson has presented ample proof of his perversion in the quote provided. His views on sexuality appear warped at best, and depraved at worst. He has twisted the sacred act of husband and wife becoming one flesh into a conquest where husband asserts his authority and power over wife, man over woman. This isn’t ‘biblical’; it stinks of worldliness. I can’t imagine how you can view this as ‘sound and compelling.’
His statements about slavery are well known, and I can provide references if needed. I just hope that your quoting him on these issues doesn’t imply agreement on those.



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 7:44 pm

I would ask that you clarify your accusation of false witness.

You are saying that Wilson is a sexual pervert. This is untrue. Therefore, you are lying.

And since you are basing that claim on this excerpt, you also have poor reading comprehension skills.

He has twisted the sacred act of husband and wife becoming one flesh into a conquest where husband asserts his authority and power over wife, man over woman

No, he hasn’t. That is neither in this excerpt nor in the book from which it is excerpted. This excerpt and the wider context of the book is about a husband’s faithfulness to love his wife through service, submission, cherishing, tenderness, responsibility, and leadership. As such, to continue arguing, in the face of all evidence and logic, that he is promoting worldly sexuality, is to lie. I challenge you to read the book and then comment with a straight face that Wilson promotes worldliness rather than biblical marriage.

The topic of slavery is not what this post is about. You’re welcome to comment on the subject of this post, even if you insist on continuing to be wrong about what it says, but otherwise you can take your antipathy for Doug Wilson somewhere else. This isn’t a “well, he’s wrong about x so I’m going to assume that he’s wrong about y” sort of blog.



Garland

July 14, 2012 at 8:14 pm

You’re acting as if this is the self-evident reading of the text, when it clearly isn’t. You have asserted what you claim the quote is about without addressing the text at all; you have provided no “evidence and logic” to persuade me.

“In other words, however we try, the sexual act cannot be made into an egalitarian pleasuring party. A man penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants. A woman receives, surrenders, accepts. This is of course offensive to all egalitarians, and so our culture has rebelled against the concept of authority and submission in marriage. This means that we have sought to suppress the concepts of authority and submission as they relate to the marriage bed.”

Here he clearly describes intercourse in forceful terms, and links it to the concept of dominance by the husband and submission by the wife. It is not, in his words, an act of mutual pleasure, but a man asserting his authority and a woman submitting to it. I do not see your interpretation as a reasonable parsing of his words, nor has anyone I have shown it to. Rather, you appear to be trying to justify him.

I believe his views on slavery are at least somewhat relevant, in that they give a dramatic example of his views on submission and dominance. Someone who can promote the institution of southern slavery (which I will note was widely accompanied by the rape of slaves by masters) is likely to misunderstand the delicate and beautiful interplay of marriage as well.



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 8:54 pm

Garland, re-read the last paragraph. "Serve and protect" vs. "devour."

If you can't see that in this excerpt, at the very least read the rest of the book before you persist in your falsehoods about what Wilson *really* means. You are wrong.

No more comments on slavery. They are off topic.



James Rednour

July 15, 2012 at 12:52 pm

"You are saying that Wilson is a sexual pervert. This is untrue. Therefore, you are lying."

How is it lying? Wilson's own words testify to the fact he is a sexual pervert. Just because you want it to be untrue does not make it so nor give you the moral high ground to call other people liars when they point out the obvious.

Wilson is a sick, sick man and is living proof that anyone can twist scripture to mean whatever they want it to mean. If you were a true follower of Christ you would denounce his assertions and post an apology for trying to justify the unjustifiable.



James Rednour

July 15, 2012 at 12:55 pm

"No more comments on slavery. They are off topic."

As well as inconvenient for you...



James Rednour

July 15, 2012 at 1:01 pm

"If you can't see that in this excerpt, at the very least read the rest of the book before you persist in your falsehoods about what Wilson *really* means. You are wrong."

Why should I read the book to justify his sickening opinions on sex? You posted this excerpt and are shocked by the revulsion it inspired. The onus is on you to show us that Wilson is not a pervert. I don't need to read "the whole story" to see that Wilson's opinions on marital sex are twisted and unscriptural. Does he refute these assertions somewhere else in the book? Is he just saying these things for shock value only to draw the reader in and then knock them down? If he doesn't then there is no reason to read any more.



Jared C. Wilson

July 15, 2012 at 5:26 pm

James, I'm sorry, but I can't help you. I don't know how I could. Doug Wilson is saying that rape is wrong, that men forcing themselves on women is wrong, and that in unrepentant overreaction to biblical authority and submission, some have devised rape fantasies and the like. If you want to disagree with him, okay. If you want to say he's saying the opposite of what he's saying, okay. There's nothing more I can say.

It certainly feels odd to be defending a guy's views of rape when his view of rape is that it is a sin that has no place, even in fantasy, role-playing scenarios, in the marriage bed. I won't even ask you to defend arguing against that, because frankly I'm bewildered. Thanks for your comment.



Bridget

July 14, 2012 at 12:25 pm

Jared -

I don't understand why you have quoted Doug Wilson except that you agree with his "personal views" as quoted. I have read neither of the books that you reference in this blog. I don't think I would want to read them; however, I might want to now read Doug Wilson's book to see what he is teaching to the followers of Christ. The entire section you quoted is not scripturally supported in any way. The quote appears to be a man's personal philosophies of why sexual brutality exists in the world. It does not exist because of improper honoring of authority and improper submission, which is what he seems to be inferring. Show me where in scripture that sexual intercourse is even described as Doug Wilson describes it above. His premise might be wrong.

You might do better to write your own ideas of why you were concerned about the book in question, rather than quote someone else and then tell people they should read the book you quote from so as to not misunderstand the quote. In this regard, I don't think Garland is bearing false witness to what you have quoted from Doug Wilson.

Did you read “50 Shades Of Grey?”

 Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 1:08 pm

Bridget, I don't need to read 50 Shades of Grey. It's proponents — not its critics — tell me it is about a couple who engages in bondage, sadism, and masochism as part of sexuality.

Wilson's entire book is full of Scripture. Big long quotes. And verses. A lot. This particular excerpt is against sexuality that “devours” and for sexuality that “serves and protects.” If you don't think there's any Scripture to support that, I suggest you read more Scripture. You might start with [1 Corinthians 7:1-5](#) and [Ephesians 5:22-33](#).

 Bridget

July 14, 2012 at 9:33 pm

Your suggestion is not necessary. I have read those scriptures often but don't find that they support his verbage on sexual intercourse, or that sexual pleasure between a husband wife has anything to do with dominance. A man does not need to “conquer” and a woman should not need to “surrender and accept.” The description he gives is not one of mutual love.

 Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 9:39 pm

Bridget, given the way you are defining them, you are right.

Given the way Wilson defines them in the context of the book, he agrees with you.

Thanks for your comments.



EMSolideoGloria

July 16, 2012 at 3:42 pm

As someone who has read FIDELITY and much of Doug Wilson's other writing (albeit some years ago), it is very hard to put a positive spin on what he says on this subject, or several others. No matter how intelligent he may be or what he has said that is true, what he says on this subject and that of southern slavery will permanently prevent me from recommending his writing.

 Bridget

July 17, 2012 at 7:34 pm

Jared -

In reference to your response on Wade's blog:

I asked above — “Show me where in scripture that sexual intercourse is even described as Doug Wilson describes it above. His premise might be wrong.”

I was referring to what Doug Wilson wrote — “A man penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants. A woman receives, surrenders, accepts. This is of course offensive to all egalitarians, and so our culture has rebelled against the concept of authority and submission in marriage. This means that we have sought to suppress the concepts of authority and submission as they relate to the marriage bed.”

Your scripture references of [1 Cor. 7:1-5](#) and [Eph. 5:22-33](#) did not answer my question.

I did not mean to infer that you did not give me scripture references. I'm sorry that I stated that poorly. What I should have said is that you did not give scripture references that answered my pointed question.

I do hope you are feeling better.

 Diane

July 14, 2012 at 5:12 pm

Can you please tell me what you think Wilson (or perhaps you) means by “good, God-honoring, and body-protecting authority and submission between husbands and wives” with reference to marital relations? I just finished chapter 7 of his book from which the quote you posted comes, and he did not elaborate other than what is written in the last paragraph of the chapter—which is the last paragraph of the quote you posted.

“When authority is honored according to the word of God it serves and protects — and gives enormous pleasure.” According to the word of God—what does he mean specifically—this authority and submission with reference to marital relations? I did not find any answer to that in the chapter other than he states that the lack of this authority and submission leads to the perversion of it.

At any rate, a rather confusing and brash quote to promote without further explanation or commentary by you, imo. But then again, he says this book Fidelity was written to be read by men and their sons and only to be read by women if given to them by their husbands. He acknowledges he may be offensive and this is not his intent...yet one wonders if one should always be so blunt simply because one can.

I also noticed something on pg 84 of the same chapter. He wrote, “Rapists are hardly a pool for selecting fine sons-in-law.”

I wonder what kind of rapist he means? Do you happen to know? Only of women? Or a pedophile rapist?

[COMMENT EDITED BY ADMIN]

 Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 6:06 pm

Can you please tell me what you think Wilson (or perhaps you) means by “good, God-honoring, and body-protecting authority and submission between husbands and wives” with reference to marital relations?

Song of Solomon, **1 Corinthians 7:1-5** and **Ephesians 5:22-33**.

In short, marital sex that maintains a husband’s masculinity and a wife’s femininity, honors each other, is an act of gracious love rather than self-centered gratification, and serves to edify and please emotionally and spiritually, not just physically.

I wonder what kind of rapist he means?

In context, it is clear he is remarking on **Exodus 22:16-17**, showing the reader that the historical option of a rapist providing a bride price for his victim to “restore her honor” did not necessitate her being his wife, as her father could certainly accept the bride price while refusing to give his daughter to a rapist.

But I suspect you knew that, and your question is rhetorical. To answer your question anyway, it is clear in the context he means a rapist of a virgin woman.

Diane, it seems clear to me your beef with Doug Wilson goes beyond this quote. I have deleted the portion of your comment that is grossly off-topic and amounts to gossip. I won’t host hearsay and character defamation at this site.

As such, if you can’t see the point of this quote, there’s nothing more I can do for you. You are free to think he means the opposite of what he means against all logic and stated context, but I won’t keep re-stating it in defense.

 Diane

July 14, 2012 at 10:53 pm

Jared,

As far as my off topic comment-it was not gossip, although I admit off topic and for that I will apologize. Nevertheless, it is documented and true fact. We are not allowed to reveal facts about someone? Surely we are to observe the actions of our Christian leaders so we can know them by their fruit. We can even talk about them and warn others. Just because something is true and negative doesn’t place it in the idle talk or rumor category.

What you could have done for me and others is comment on the quote and provide some clarity instead of simply placing it there. For example...

“In short, marital sex that maintains a husband’s masculinity and a wife’s femininity, honors each other, is an act of gracious love rather than self-centered gratification, and serves to edify and please emotionally and spiritually, not just physically.”

would have been a very nice commentary to place at the beginning of Wilson’s quote that might have informed us and softened the offense that Wilson did not intend with his rather rough language.

Thank you for your time.



Jared C. Wilson

July 15, 2012 at 5:28 pm

Diane, thanks for your comment. I am grateful for the advice and will truly consider it next time around I’m aware that something could be controversial.



Scott

July 14, 2012 at 8:19 pm

Since you asked Douglas to stop by, I’ll dare to repeat my exhortation from Justin Taylor’s blog. Please explain to me, in clear and uncertain terms, Wilson’s views on southern slavery. I want to hear a clear condemnation on everything it represented and all the atrocities that were committed. Until I hear that, his credibility will always be in question.



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 8:57 pm

Scott, I asked Wilson to answer the charges relevant to this post. He is under no obligation to, since it is clear the commenters here are insisting on things that are not there. But perhaps commenters may be persuaded from “the horse’s mouth,” so to speak.

He is under no obligation to talk about slavery here, because that’s off topic.

For the record, and the last thing I’ll say on the topic,

- 1) I don’t know Wilson’s views of Southern slavery.
- 2) Since the commenters here cannot grasp the meaning of this excerpt, I am not prone to think their grasp of his views on slavery are very accurate anyway.
- 3) I personally believe slavery of the sort found in the historical American south to be sinful.

That’s the last I’ll entertain on this (off) topic. Any further comments on that topic will be deleted.



Bridget

July 14, 2012 at 9:46 pm

Jared -

Today was the first day I have ever commented on your blog. I find your 2nd point above uncharitable. Even the comment to me earlier of “I suggest you read more Scripture” sounds condescending. It seems that everyone who commented here today can’t understand the quote .

..



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 10:03 pm

Bridget, I am finding most of these comments about Wilson’s view on marital sexuality uncharitable.

I know most (all?) of the critics are coming from the same blog where this post was linked in the comments. I see more misunderstanding of this post and the book it comes from abounding in that thread. It appears that the post/thread there are anti-Wilson; therefore, the commenters coming here are doing so with predetermined criticism. I should say that *this* is an uncharitable exercise.

If you want to disagree with the post, that is fine. But to say that he is saying the opposite of what he is saying is going to result in me correcting. I have read the book. I know Wilson is not advocating force in marriage or women accepting abuse or power trips. So if someone says he’s saying that, of course I’m going to correct it.

I can’t stop people from reading the quote and either misunderstanding it or having a reaction to the word choice that leads them to not care about his actual meaning, but I can certainly point out when this appears to be happening.

It seems that everyone who commented here today can’t understand the quote

I agree.



Scott

July 14, 2012 at 10:38 pm

Or, you could have given some explanatory comments following the excerpt. Or, even better, maybe Wilson would write with greater clarity when explicating such a provocative thesis. I understand your frustration, but what kind of a reaction did you expect when you posted this?



Jared C. Wilson

July 14, 2012 at 10:50 pm

Scott, I provided explanation of the general meaning in the introductory paragraph.

I did not find the passage unclear, obviously, or else I wouldn’t have posted it. There’s enough context to see he is not advocating force but speaking against it. For those who have eyes to see, and all that.

what kind of a reaction did you expect when you posted this?

I confess I did not expect people to accuse Wilson of supporting rape, mainly b/c neither this passage nor the book supports such thinking but also because it is such an absurd accusation. Out of left field, so to speak.



Hamburglar

July 14, 2012 at 9:49 pm

Douglas Wilson turned me into a newt !



James Rednour

July 15, 2012 at 12:35 pm

This is truly the sickest thing I have ever read on TGC, and that’s saying a lot.



Jared C. Wilson

July 15, 2012 at 5:29 pm

James, as I said above, if you find a guy saying that rape is wrong and that even “pretend” rape in the guise of erotica or role-playing or fantasy is not fitting for the marriage bed to be a “sickening” viewpoint, I can’t help you. Thanks for your comment.



Jared C. Wilson

July 15, 2012 at 5:31 pm

Welcome, Wartburg Watch readers.



Sergius Martin-George

July 15, 2012 at 7:51 pm

Thanks, Jared! It’s great to be here!



Justin Runyan

July 15, 2012 at 7:57 pm

Wow! Did I just enter bizarro world where words mean the opposite of what they mean — down means up, left means right, “serves and protects” some how is twisted into meaning devour and exploit?

Jared, just so you know you didn’t mysteriously wake up in Oppositeville, I completely understand your post and explanation.



David

July 15, 2012 at 8:24 pm

Jared,

Can you give some example of what “good, God-honoring, and body-protecting authority and submission between husbands and wives” might look like in practical application? I’m all for good God-honoring, so perhaps you might focus on the other aspects. How would you counsel a young man to apply these as “an erotic necessity?”

Let me explain. I received what I considered excellent pre-marital advice from Doug’s father in a little class for men about women (and Doug’s mom taught one session). He tried to get us to link our true heart intentions with our words and deeds, in applying the Eph. 5 tasks of husbands (Love, give, sanctify, cleanse, present, love, love, nourish, cherish, unite, become one flesh, love). Most memorable example: “Never ask a woman to marry you unless you’ve told her you love her. And never tell a woman you love her without intending to marry her.”

I can go for the “protects and serves” tasks in his last paragraph as synonymous with Eph 5, but the “penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants”? Are these part of “good authority” in the marriage bed? Do they bear any relationship to “the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife” from 1 Cor 7, or the bridegroom’s words in the Song of Songs, “You have ravished (captured) my heart, my sister, my bride!”?



Jared C. Wilson

July 15, 2012 at 8:40 pm

David, thank you for your comment and for your question(s).

I would actually point back to 1 Cor. 7 as a good application of what body-protecting authority and submission look like. Doug Wilson actually interacts with that passage and others in this book. There’s a good example in the Q&A in the back, which I assume is “imagined” (or hypothetical, rather), which goes something like this (from my memory):

Q: Should my wife have sex with me whenever I want it?

A: Don’t be a fathead.

Q: It’s a serious question.

A: Yes, she should have sex with you when you want it. And you should not want to have sex when she wants to refrain.

Wilson goes on to elucidate the mutual submission of the marital bed as it pertains to 1 Cor. 7.

I’m sorry that I can’t adequately respond to what somebody told you in a class you attended. I wasn’t there. As you report it, the advice isn’t exactly what I would give somebody, I don’t think, depending on circumstances, but I don’t find it particularly egregious.

The context of Wilson’s book makes it plain that a husband’s responsibility is to cherish, nurture, and protect his wife. The context of this passage makes it plain that his view of authority and submission has as its aim “serving and protecting.”

but the “penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants”? Are these part of “good authority” in the marriage bed?

It is difficult to understand, I’m sure, when they are defined with violence in mind. In this isolated passage Wilson has ruled that out. We can call him a liar, but he’s clearly identifying these traits as masculine in ways that protect and serve wives, so the logical thing to do is not assume his lying or saying the opposite of what he’s saying but rather read that phrase in context. Wilson connects that sort of masculine mandate to the mandate given to Adam to take dominion and subdue. There is no indication in that passage in Genesis, as forceful as it sounds, that violence or “against another’s will” is being advocated.

Neither when Christ says “The kingdom comes forcefully and men take it by force” is he advocating physical violence. These are words of zeal, leadership, bravery, cultivation, boldness, and the like. These are very much in play in the bedroom — although Wilson is speaking of the larger masculine mandate and then connecting it to the bedroom — and in the context of the Scripture’s teaching (and Wilson’s book) do not at all advocate violating a wife’s will or using force or violence or manipulation of any kind. The chapter — and this passage excerpted — speak directly against that.

I can totally understand egalitarians disagreeing with Wilson’s complementarianism. Seriously, I can.

What I can’t understand is people asserting that he believes the opposite of what he’s actually saying, some even referring to “Wilson’s rape views” in a cynical way as if to imply he is pro-rape, when in fact there is zero (zilch, nada) to indicate that is true, and in fact there is an abundance of material to indicate the opposite.

Again, thanks for your comment.



Melody

July 18, 2012 at 12:21 am

With concern, as a sister in Christ I have to take issue with a lot of what I am hearing from Doug Wilson, but two points you mention suffice:

1. “A: Yes, she should have sex with you when you want it. And you should not want to have sex when she wants to refrain.” I’m sorry, but that is not realistic. We cannot help our “wants” and they are not necessarily right or wrong. I think what Doug W is saying, in my opinion badly, is that sex should be a mutual decision- not forced on the wife. Fact is, the wife can be guilty of forcing it on the husband too! As a woman, I know this to be true. We can’t realistically control

our “wants”, we can only control our behavior in love. And neither partner has the right to force the other in or out of sex. There is a lot of freedom in marriage, it’s not about rules, or that spoils the moment!

2. I understand the concept Doug Wilson is trying to explain- that of authority and submission to back up the official “complementarian” view. (My Mac just corrected that because “complementarianism” is such a new concept it isn’t even a word yet.) I understand he is trying to address the issue of domination in sex.

However, I take issue with his frankly horrific description of marital sex because 1 Corinthians 7, plus the creation story, plus **Galatians 3:28** make it abundantly clear that although men and women are different and complementary in form, they are equal in Christ- and in the bedroom. The man’s body belongs to the wife as much as the wife’s body belongs to the man. If a woman is being taught she must simply be a receptacle, that is the most demeaning and destructive thing I have ever heard said to a child of God. Mutual pleasure can only come when there is mutual pleasing!

Really tired of hearing this stuff coming from trusted Bible teachers when it isn’t even based on a passage of Scripture, just “human tradition” and observations from anthropology.



Leila

July 15, 2012 at 10:04 pm

“Wilson connects that sort of masculine mandate to the mandate given to Adam to take dominion and subdue.”

Jared, the mandate given to take dominion and subdue was not solely a “masculine” mandate (whatever that means), thus Doug Wilson’s connection is quite weak. It was a mandate given to both the man and the woman, and it did not involve dominion over other persons. Nowhere is the man commanded to take dominion over the woman. **Gen 1:26** tells us “Then God said, ‘Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals,[a] and over all the creatures that move along the ground.’”



EMSoliDeoGloria

July 16, 2012 at 3:58 pm

Leila said what I was going to. The problem is that patriarchalists like Wilson get the Bible wrong from Genesis on, and that has rather disastrous consequences, no matter how smart someone might be.

God never gave Adam dominion over Eve. He gave them dominion over the rest of creation, as “under-sovereigns,” in essence they, under God, were to care for what God had made for them to enjoy.



Melody

July 18, 2012 at 12:44 am

Thanks girls. The domination AND abusive authority stuff is straight from the Fall. When are men going to wake up and start realizing that adults regardless of sex are called to be stewards of God’s creation and start respecting women as “coheirs” regardless of their physical differences? I think somehow there are a whole lot more ladies out there speaking by the Spirit of God than some of the sewage coming out of the authoritarian leaderships I am seeing. I react because I am hurt. So sad.



David

July 15, 2012 at 10:16 pm

Jared,
Just to clarify, the teacher of the class I attended was Doug’s father. I thought his advice was very sound, and later followed it, and am glad I did. “Dad” undoubtedly gave Doug similar advice. But notice the different emphasis. “Dad” emphasized the special LOVE of husband for wife as picturing Christ’s LOVE for the church, and I remember this decades later. In this chapter of Doug’s book, he emphasizes AUTHORITY. Combined with words like conquers, colonizes, and surrenders, this AUTHORITY emphasis makes me wonder how Doug views Christ’s love for the church. Can you give me some other writings where Doug clearly states his view?
Still would like to hear how you would personally apply this chapter in counseling a young man about the bedroom. Would you advise against seeking mutual “rights” in favor of his just getting the “planting” done whenever his wife “surrenders”? Against certain activities where the wife might seem to be in charge? Against his “submitting” when his wife initiates things? If not, what might this authority in the bedroom look like? How might he clear up the waters for the folks out there in the “kinky” crowd?



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 9:00 am

Would you advise against seeking mutual “rights” in favor of his just getting the “planting” done whenever his wife “surrenders”?

“Just getting the planting done?” No.

Against certain activities where the wife might seem to be in charge?

“Certain activities?” Yes. Not all activities. Depends on what you mean by “in charge” and what the activities are.

Against his “submitting” when his wife initiates things?

No. (Meaning, no, I’m not against that.)

How might he clear up the waters for the folks out there in the “kinky” crowd?

I assume by “he,” you mean Doug Wilson. If you read *Fidelity* it is abundantly clear that Doug Wilson is against any shade of “kinky” sex. He even addresses that word “kinky” directly in the book.



David

July 16, 2012 at 8:51 pm

I mean a man who you might be teaching or counseling. How would you apply this article in real life?



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 8:57 pm

David, I'd tell him that his mandate to “subdue the earth” in relation to his family is to do so in a way that makes his wife *flourish*, not wither, and therefore this means his authority over here must be one that humbly serves and protects, that cherishes and edifies. This means, specifically and practically, that sex that demeans, forces, manipulates, abuses — or in Wilson's words “devours” — is off limits. So things like “rape fantasy” erotica or BDSM or rape fantasy role playing games are wrong.



David

July 16, 2012 at 9:10 pm

I'd tell him mostly the same, except that his authority is not “over” her but “for” her, just as Christ's headship over all things in Eph 1 is not over the church, but for her. And that the mandate to subdue the earth was given to man and woman jointly, not man alone.



Clay Crouch

July 16, 2012 at 12:54 pm

Twaddle. What rocks do you find these guys under? What's next, slavery is a good thing? Idaho, where the men are men and the women are women, and all the sheep are ... led to the slaughter.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 3:07 pm

What rocks do you find these guys under?

Well, as you mentioned, the rocks in Idaho.



Clay Crouch

July 16, 2012 at 3:46 pm

You know, Mr. Wilson, the more I've thought about the excerpt from Douglas Wilson's book the more I'm flummoxed. His assertion in your final paragraph would lead me to conclude that the rape of women (and I assume men as well), as a judgment of God, is a relatively new phenomenon. Would Douglas Wilson, as paleo-confederate, have us believe that back in the “good old days” of near absolute male authority and female submission rape was a rare occurrence? Please say it ain't so.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 3:55 pm

Clay, I'm sorry you're flummoxed.

His assertion in your final paragraph would lead me to conclude that the rape of women (and I assume men as well), as a judgment of God, is a relatively new phenomenon.

No, in fact he bases his assertions on Scripture references like [Zech. 14:2](#) and [Job 31:9](#) and [Eccl. 8:11](#).

Would Douglas Wilson, as paleo-confederate, have us believe that back in the “good old days” of near absolute male authority and female submission rape was a rare occurrence? Please say it ain't so.

It ain't so. In fact he elucidates his assertion with references to both Scripture and the days of Augustine and later.

Also, one misunderstanding and outright false claim I'm seeing in this discussion is that Wilson is saying rape is God's judgment on the victim. This is not so. He clearly says the opposite on pg.82 of the book. What he's saying is that the prevalence of rape is an aspect of God's judgment upon a culture/society that fails to cherish and protect women. He plainly says a victim of rape is “innocent” (his words) in the discussion.

It's obviously fine to disagree with what a man says. It is not fine to invent things he hasn't said to disagree with.



Southwestern Discomfort

July 16, 2012 at 2:57 pm

As a single, never-married, sexually experienced woman of a certain age, I would NEVER let a man who believes what Doug Wilson says here into my life, much less my bed.

And, frankly, I see little difference between the sadomasochistic domination apparently practiced in “50 Shades of Grey” and the domination preached by Wilson. I actually wouldn't know, because I've not read the “50 Shades” books and have no intention of doing so. This literary dreck started life as Twilight fan fiction and were then reworked to avoid copyright issues. Considering the source material, there is so much better to read out there.

It's worth pointing out that both "50 Shades" and Doug Wilson see women in the same way: as objects to be acted upon by men. It's bluntly obvious that Wilson doesn't see any woman as his equal in any area of life. Instead, we're to be "penetrate[d], conquer[ed], colonize[d], plant[ed]," by the ideas and beliefs of the so much more worthy male sex. Because, of course, as women, we are supposed to "receive[s], surrender[s]" and "accept[s]" from the men who have authority in our lives.

Of course, none of this is a surprise to me, since it is part of your belief system that women as a class are absolutely incompetent to teach and lead men. It makes sense to me that you'd also say the same thing about marriage. The problem is that you're not going to make very many converts to this point of view, particularly in a time when women have jobs and lives where we are in authority to or work underneath female authority. It wouldn't surprise me to learn that you believe if a woman can't submit to male authority in all areas of her life, that she's probably not saved. *shrug* It matters not to me as I decided quite a long time ago that I'd rather go to hell than worship the god of Calvinism.

Perhaps the one thing you might come away with from all this foofawraw is that you can't say these things in a corner and not expect that it's going to pass by unnoticed. This is the Internet; you WILL get called out and probably in a better, more intelligently worded comment than mine here. But let me be clear: there's no way on earth I'd worship your god and your "Jesus," because, as a woman, I am no man's inferior. Even if your doctrine says I am inferior.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 3:07 pm

SD, thanks for your comment. You have several things wrong about what I believe, but I am learning in this thread that stating what I actually believe is no persuasion to those convinced otherwise, so with clear conscience I no longer feel it necessary to point them out. Peace to you.



Southwestern Discomfort

July 16, 2012 at 5:30 pm

Actually, Jared, I'd really like you to comment on one thing, which is my comparison between the sadoomasochistic submissiveness of "50 Shades of Grey" and the "receiving, surrendering and accepting" that is part of Doug Wilson's beliefs on female sexuality. I don't think that my comparison is far off—both "50 Shades" and Wilson see women as objects to be dominated and acted upon.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 5:37 pm

I've answered this question in countless ways in this thread already, but I'll give it one more go, in good faith.

Wilson see[s] women as objects to be dominated and acted upon.

My comment is that this is not true. At least, it's not derivable from the book I'm quoting. Nowhere does he advocate the use of force in sexuality or even the pressuring of an uninterested wife to have sex against her desire. He speaks plainly against it.

The onus is on the ones making the charges to find one passage where Wilson says husbands may force themselves on unwilling wives. Show me one.

I'm growing weary of saying what Wilson says in the book in the face of stubborn refusal to believe it. It is no longer my responsibility if anyone persists in believing outright falsehoods or unfounded imaginings about what Wilson believes in the matters pertaining to this posted excerpt.



Jim

July 16, 2012 at 5:13 pm

For all those who would like to get a deeper understanding Doug Wilson's perspective on human sexuality please see the below post. These are videos from the presentations Pr. Wilson gave at Indiana University earlier this year. He did, from my perspective, provide a faithful witness to the Gospel and it's implications all the while under intense fire.

<http://www.canonwired.com/bloomington/>

I would also commend to you the "Queer-In Fact Check" sheet that is posted at the bottom of the page. It is quite amazing (shocking, really) to me that many of the points were levied at Pr. Wilson by the raw pagans at IU are showing up in the above posts. Hence the origins of the "Queer-In Fact Sheet". And before anyone vents a spleen about the phrase "Queer-In", Wilson was merely echoing the phrase used to rally the groups in opposition to Wilson's presence at IU.

I am not being snarky when I say this, but Wilson will challenge you to think. So if this not something that you are not used to, gird your loins, put you thinking caps on, and have some fun!!! 😊



Scott

July 16, 2012 at 5:28 pm

Wilson stirred the pot when his people handed out that ridiculous flyer before the event got started. He yelled, at least in print, as loud as they did.



Truth Unites... and Divides

July 16, 2012 at 5:39 pm

"He yelled, at least in print, as loud as they did."

No way.



Jim

July 16, 2012 at 9:10 pm

He “stirred the pot” by clearly claiming a moral standard that exists outside ourselves and by which we will all be held accountable. Keep Calm and Carry On all.....



Matthew

July 16, 2012 at 5:51 pm

Jared,

I’m wondering what is the point of promoting writings like this.

No matter what Mr. Wilson’s greater point is, he gets there with lightning rod language and imagery that leave a taste of revulsion.

Jared, what have you really accomplished here, other than promoting your own blog with controversy?

Professional christian thinkers obviously have way too much time on their hands, to have the sheer opportunity to pontificate to this degree.



Jared C. Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 6:05 pm

Matthew, thank you for your comment and questions.

I’m wondering what is the point of promoting writings like this.

My point is stated in the introductory paragraph. I think it is an insightful analysis as to the popularity of “rape fantasy” cultural phenomena like 50 Shades of Grey. I think the main point — which is that worldly culture’s rejection of biblical gender roles has come back like a specter to bite us — is a smart one.

what have you really accomplished here, other than promoting your own blog with controversy?

The only people who are “promoting my blog” are the critics. That was not my intent, since I didn’t anticipate people objecting to what was written. Indeed, everyone who has done so thus far has done so for either off-topic reasons (they don’t like what Wilson says about other things) or reasons imagined or misunderstood (they propose he means the opposite of what he says).

I believe that *I* accomplished posting an insightful point from a smart thinker on a popular subject. I believe commenters accomplished a lot of hand-wringing and accusations.

Not anticipating that would be the case, the only thing I could have done to prevent that from happening is disapprove all the negative comments. But it’s not my policy to do so (contrary to the claims of others out there who routinely lie about my comment policy), so long as commenters are respectful of each other, stay on topic, and do not use profanity. If those rules are followed, one can disagree to their heart’s content, and even call into question my salvation and/or manhood.

If you are really concerned about this post being inordinately promoted, you should likewise chastise all the commenters here and at the Wartburg Watch blog. They’ve kept the thread busy and linked to it more than I have.



Douglas Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 6:36 pm

Well, hi, everyone. Sorry for being so late to the party — I just now found out about it.

My apologies to Jared for causing him so much grief, and my compliments to him for giving a very good account of what I was saying and not saying. Not only was I not saying many of the things attributed to me above, but I abhor them.

That said, I would be happy to answer any specific questions about the issue.



David

July 16, 2012 at 9:03 pm

Hi, Doug,

By “Water” which some deny they need, do you mean that living water referred by Jesus, or that “True authority and true submission are therefore an erotic necessity.”? Either way, some further definition and application of that statement to marriages would be appreciated.



Douglas Wilson

July 16, 2012 at 10:03 pm

David, by pure water versus polluted water, I meant godly sexuality expressed within the confines set forth in God’s Word. But then, godly marriage (pure water) is a reflection, as Paul teaches in Ephesians 5, of the ultimate living water. So ultimately, I think it would have to refer to both.



David

July 16, 2012 at 10:39 pm

Thanks Doug,

How does an erotic necessity of of authority and submission fit into this reflection, and what scriptures do you think most strongly support such a necessity?



Douglas Wilson

July 17, 2012 at 1:01 am

David, I would point to a couple things. First, Paul uses the word authority with regard to sexual relations in 1 Cor. 7 — applying it equally to both men and women — but I

would argue the differences between the sexes will affect how that authority is wielded. The second thing would take a Pauline form of argument — “does not nature itself teach you . . .?” I was arguing in that excerpted section that the nature of the sexual act itself shows us this.



David

July 17, 2012 at 12:31 pm

No! Nature does not teach us that sexual relations between husband and wife are about authority being “wielded” and neither does scripture. Authority is wielded in rape, where the “wielder” must “surrender” and be “conquered” by the mn in charge. The 1 Cor 7 “authority” is about husbands and wives (not men and women in general) mutually giving each other his/her “due”, which you condemn as an egalitarian pleasuring party. Then you go on to give rapists an excuse by implying normal men have rape fantasies and women are “asking for it” by reading romance novels.



David

July 17, 2012 at 12:40 pm

Tell me why [Eph 5:1](#) and [Eph 5:18](#) should not be the prime directives in Christian marriages with [Eph 5:21](#) as one example, and the following verses, in which Paul “forgot” to mention authority as a husbandly duty, as an “unpacking”.



David

July 17, 2012 at 12:46 pm

When a rapist, or an abusive authority-wielding husband or boyfriend, is in charge, I think you'll agree he's not a real man, but a ” mn”. 😊



David

July 17, 2012 at 1:38 pm

One more thing, I almost forgot, and then I will forever hold my peace. I can paraphrase the main point of this post as “Some people practice perverted bondage and discipline. We have denied the need for bondage and discipline, so this polluted water springs up. We must counteract this with GOOD bondage and discipline, which is the pure water. But the Gospel says, “Only bondage to and discipline of a PERFECT MAN will do. Only the water He gives will slake our thirst, water the tree of life, and bring us its healing leaves. Bondage to and discipline of imperfect men “shall not be so among you”. If your mother had gone to postwar Japan and said, “You have been submitting in a perverted way to a polluted authority (the emperor)” she would have been correct. But if she had gone on to say, “You must submit to a better authority, our President, and he's so much better for XYZ reasons” she would have been presenting a deficient gospel.



Dee Parsons

July 16, 2012 at 7:12 pm

Jared

I will be discussing this thread on Wednesday but I want to make a confession. I did not read your post prior to linking to it. I plan to tell my readers this on Wednesday. I was making a simple point that Doug Wilson is gaining a great deal of support at TGC and that is concerning to me in light of the slavery issue which I discussed more in depth today. We have received over 300 comments to the original post so far which is a goodly amount.

I put Wilson's name into the TGC search field and quite a few articles came up. Yours was first in the listing so I simply linked to it to prove my point that Wilson is considered a current “top notch” “go to” guy by many at TGC.

Imagine my surprise when I learned about the controversial nature of your post. And yes, it is my opinion, as well, that the Wilson statement was both controversial and offensive but I understand that you think it was great. I will discuss that statement on my next post.

Our readers do not take our word for things. They check our links and references as Bereans should. I do not know some of the monikers of the people who have posted here so I do not know if they all came from our blog. You would know through Google Analytics. However, perhaps we need to consider that my link to your post was guided by the sure Hand of our Father.

We may disagree on much but I wish you well in your blogging enterprise. It has been one of the most astonishing and challenging adventures of my life.



Matthew Kleinhans

July 16, 2012 at 7:22 pm

The comments have been a fascinating tutorial in reading comprehension. Thanks for sharing this quote, Jared- Pastor (Doug) Wilson is again right on point- what a striking image: lusting after polluted water. Rebellion is a tragic downward spiral. Thanks be to God for the mercy of Christ available to sexual sinners like me!



Jason

July 16, 2012 at 9:59 pm

I'm genuinely confused by people's response to this post. I'm not sure whether it's a result of people reading into the excerpt what they want to hear, or if it's a genuine lack of reading comprehension, but either way it's really baffling. All Doug Wilson is saying is that God has designed marriage in such a way that the husband is the head of the household, and the wife is to lovingly, respectfully, and in a Christ-like manner submit to his authority. (This may not be a popular teaching, and it's certainly nuanced, but

it is what the Bible clearly teaches.) Because we naturally rebel against God, we tend to pervert His ways and His designs, thus you have rape fantasies, etc.

I might add that my favorite part of this conversation is Jared's response to Garland, which I believe could be applied to the vast majority of the comments on this post.

"You are saying that Wilson is a sexual pervert. This is untrue. Therefore, you are lying. And since you are basing that claim on this excerpt, you also have poor reading comprehension skills."



Pam

July 17, 2012 at 12:50 am

Jason, some of use read much more than the excerpt – we read the chapter the excerpt was from (others might have read more, they can answer how much they read if they want to). My point is, though, that these aren't knee-jerk handwringing comments, they are informed by reading more than a couple of paragraphs. Firstly, there's the line in this excerpt that sex can't be an 'egalitarian pleasuring party', because I'm pretty sure mutual pleasure is generally a desirable thing in sexual relationships. So either that comment is incredibly poorly worded or it is simply false. In the wider chapter, there isn't any sense that women have any involvement in decision-making over their sexuality, they simply receive – be it good marital sex or bad rape. Third is the 'rape is God's judgement' stuff, which, apart from being theologically dodgy is a very hurtful thing to say, even if you try and defend it as just being a 'societal' rather than 'individual' judgement, given the victim is a part of the society, too, and the sort of God that would punish a society generally by having something so awful happen to the less powerful members of that society is a cruel and petty God that I – and I suspect many others – just couldn't believe in. Fourth is the completely false 'rape is more common now' argument Doug makes. Rape is more reported now, and we have only in the last 40 years recognised that marital rape is rape, so the statistics of rape reporting went up, but reporting is not the same as the incidence of rape. Fact is, more reporting (and therefore prosecuting) of rape is a good thing, and one of the achievements of the women's rights movement is the fact that rape is now taken seriously. Finally, women were considered chattel at the time the bible was written – they didn't have any rights or protections, were thought of as inferior physically, intellectually, emotionally, psychologically, you name it. We're more enlightened now. Why we seem to want to hark back to a time when women weren't even considered as real adults I don't understand.



Douglas Wilson

July 17, 2012 at 1:13 am

Pam, the reason we are discussing all this is that 50 Shades of Gray is on the NYT bestseller list. It was our enlightened and liberated society that put it there. So the reaction above (to my opposition to such perversions) seems to me to be just plain weird. It is a reasonable question to ask what 50 Shades is doing up there on the top of the literary world.

It is also reasonable to ask who would stand a better chance of getting invited to a swank Manhattan cocktail party for the liberated literati – someone like me or the author of 50 Shades? I think that women ought to be treated with dignity and respect, so that lets me out. The author of 50 Shades thinks that deep down women want to be worked over a bit, so he is clearly still in the running.

What a world we live in!



EMSoliDeoGloria

July 17, 2012 at 10:28 am

It is sad to me that 50 Shades is a bestseller. I glanced at it briefly when I was at Costco last week and I probably shouldn't even have done that. The view of human sexuality it presents does not glorify God, to say the least.

Mr. Wilson and I would agree about the false messages of pornography and this sort of erotica. We surely would disagree about the messages he appears to take from nature about sexuality, however. Sadly, I believe his writing also distorts the nature of human sexuality.

Mr. Wilson, I don't believe the reaction – at least mine and those who have read much of your writing on gender issues – is about your opposition to perversion. Maybe it's about something else? – maybe the way your writing disrespects women, although not in the same way 50 Shades does. It is rather disrespectful to treat any human being, made in the image of God, as if she (who is made to glorify, know and enjoy God) existed to be an accessory to another human being, also made in the image of God. That concept is throughout your books that deal with marriage, gender and human sexuality, and is especially strongly presented in chapter 2 of Reforming Marriage.



Caleb W

July 17, 2012 at 12:49 pm

Well said. Mr Wilson, this has nothing to with your aversion to perversion. It has everything to do with views like:

"In other words, however we try, the sexual act cannot be made into an egalitarian pleasuring party. A man penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants. A woman receives, surrenders, accepts. This is of course offensive to all egalitarians, and so our culture has rebelled against the concept of authority and submission in marriage. This means that we have sought to suppress the concepts of authority and submission as they relate to the marriage bed."

If you cannot see why this is abusive towards women, then I will pray for you.

I also think that it is unfair to suggest that someone who thinks that women ought to be treated with dignity and respect has no place in arts or intellectual circles. That is an incredibly out-of-touch and ridiculous opinion. You're attacking a straw man argument there.



Pam

July 17, 2012 at 8:16 pm

Thank you Caleb and EMSoli, you've summed it up perfectly.



Pam

July 17, 2012 at 8:15 pm

The author of 50 shades is female.

Just to make clear, I'm not saying that to defend the book in any way, personally I prefer to ignore lowgrade trash, but I find it telling that you immediately assume an author is male.



Douglas Wilson

July 17, 2012 at 9:20 pm

Pam, you find it telling that I instinctively assume better things about women than that? At the same time, I do stand corrected.

Okay, I guess it is not possible to talk about this without talking about it. "Penetrates." Is anyone maintaining that this is not a feature of intercourse? "Plants." Is the biblical concept of *seed* misogynistic? "Conquer." Her neck is like the tower of David, and her necklace is like a thousand bucklers. "Colonize." A garden locked is my sister, my bride. C'mon, people, work with me here.

Only a person with a poetic ear like three feet of tin foil would maintain that penetrates can only be used of a Nazi invasion of Belgium, or that plants means that a man must treat his woman like dirt, or that conquering can only be done by ravaging Huns, and that colonization can only occur in a Haitian cane break.

What I was talking about occurs within the bounds of a man and a woman who love and respect one another, mirroring the relationship of Christ and the Church. Anyone who believes that my writing disrespects women either has not read enough of my writing on the subject to say anything whatever about it or, if they still have that view after reading enough pages, they really need to retake their ESL class. A third option — the one I think pertains here — they could surrender the *a priori* notion that I must be crammed into their mental caricature of a conservative complementarian.

"A given man may make a very bad husband; you cannot mend matters by trying to reverse the roles. He may make a bad partner in a dance. The cure for that is that men should more diligently attend dancing classes; not that the ballroom should henceforward ignore distinctions of sex and treat all dancers as neuter. That would, of course, be eminently sensible, civilized, and enlightened, but, once more, 'not nearly so much like a Ball'" — C.S. Lewis



Bekah M

July 17, 2012 at 11:48 pm

This entire conversation exposes what has become a serious issue for a vast majority of our society; there is a general inability/unwillingness to read beyond the most popular and/or polarizing definition of a word. Readers tend to be lazy; we want things spelled out for us so that little critical thinking is required.

I would hope that your explanation of your choice of words would clarify enough to avoid Christians drawing sides and declaring war over a post with which we all claim to agree. From my understanding, all Jared was observing is that "50 Shades of Grey" is a prime example of how godly sexuality is twisted into dominance and aggression and that your observation in "Fidelity" is that rape (like all sin) is a twisting of God's design.

Praying people will ask for an explanation and clarification as opposed to offering an attack based on the assumption that we're all working with the same definitions and connotations. Your words are challenging and controversial to be sure, but the reaction to them here is surprising to me.

I hope that all involved here will remember that our "family" disagreement is taking place before a watching world, and we all know that families fighting in public end up as Jerry Springer re-runs and YouTube viral videos. Surely the family of God can avoid Springer-esque public embarrassment.



Karissa

July 18, 2012 at 12:00 am

Others have already sufficiently expressed my opinions on the actual excerpt in the post, so I wasn't planning to comment until now. Your flippant dismissal of those who disagree with you and/or interpret your writing in a way you don't like is incredibly disrespectful. Your mention of "their ESL class" seems to be the most egregious, though I could point out others.

I understand that you may be offended by some of the comments in this post, particularly if you feel you have been misinterpreted or misrepresented. But the way you have responded is offensive in turn. You blow off the criticisms of your ideas by telling people they are not "reading enough pages," rather than trying to understand and respond to the actual critiques. You are using a straw man. Whether or not others have done the same in these comments, it is a lazy way to argue and adds nothing to the discussion.



Dave M

July 18, 2012 at 12:28 am

Well that's insulting. Also, don't disrespect C.S. Lewis by using his words so grossly out of context, sir.

 Rachel H. Evans

July 18, 2012 at 12:57 am

I will be writing a full response to this piece tomorrow. I find it deplorable and upsetting.

But here I must respond to your careless and selective use of Song of Songs to support your point of view. You quote the male speaker in the poem while ignoring the Shulamite girl, who initiates much of the action in the romance. She is the first to speak in the poem, declaring, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth" (1:1). She actively seeks out the handsome shepherd in his fields, saying "Why should I be like a veiled woman beside the flocks of your friends?" (v. 7). When the two are separated, she goes out into the streets, looking for him, and at one point is accosted by the city guards. When she finds him, she brings him into a private room. There, she says, "I held him and would not him go" (3:4). The man confesses "you have ravished my heart." It is she who initiates a sexual encounter in a vineyard in the countryside, and it is she who offers her lover a frank invitation to drink her wine and to enter her "garden" to taste its choice fruits.

This notion that women are designed to be the passive recipients of men's "conquering" and "colonization" represents a sick distortion of the truth that is as unbiblical as it is disgusting.

 William

July 18, 2012 at 2:51 am

Mr. Douglas Wilson,

First, let me say that I take issue with your stating that commenters who don't understand what you're trying to say "need to retake their ESL class." To imply that those who find your writing problematic must not have an adequate grasp of the language is extremely condescending. The fact that someone felt the need to distribute the "Queer-In Fact Sheet," referenced above by Jim, before one of your talks leads me to believe that such reactions to your work are not uncommon. I know taking criticism is difficult, but assuming that your opponents either don't understand English or have "crammed [you] into their mental caricature" is not a very mature way to respond.

Second, you chose to use the words "conquers" and "colonizes" to describe your view of what healthy, God-honoring sexual interaction should entail. These words have violent connotations, which you were aware of when you used them. You say "Only a person with a poetic ear like three feet of tin foil would maintain . . . that colonization can only occur in a Haitian cane break." You have to realize, though, that when the word "colonizes" is used, it is going to evoke the most recent and vivid sense of that word. In other words, when you say "colonize," people are going to think of Haiti and the countless other places where violent atrocities, including rape, occurred. They are not going to assume that your evoking a passage in Song of Solomon where that word is not used and which does not seem to refer directly to colonization. A good poet is aware of not only the various connotations of a given word, but also the most common. So, it's not bad poetic ears you're dealing with, but just bad poetry.

Thirdly, I disagree with the notion that rape fantasy arises in any way from egalitarian relationships. This seems to be an example of cum hoc ergo propter hoc. That a rise in egalitarian attitudes toward marriage coincides with the appearance of Fifty Shades of Gray on the NYT Best-Seller list does not mean that the first caused the second. After all, the popularity of the writings attributed to the Marquis de Sade in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth centuries proves that a fascination with violent forms of sexuality is not unique to our time, and I highly doubt that the Marquis de Sade's France was particularly egalitarian.

Furthermore, I doubt that, if I were to read a more significant portion of your book than the one provided, I would find any scientific evidence supporting the claim that rape fantasies arise from our having "banished authority and submission." If you're implying that individuals exposed to or engaged in egalitarian relationships are more prone to rape fantasies, let me state, as anecdotal evidence, that my wife and I have an egalitarian marriage, and not only do I not "dream of being [a] rapist," but my wife has expressed no desire to ever "wistfully [read] novels in which someone ravishes the 'soon to be willing' heroine." It would seem, to me, more reasonable to assume that women are drawn to such novels due to a lack of sexual satisfaction caused by their partner's unwillingness to engage in "an egalitarian pleasuring party," but I don't like to judge. If, however, you're implying that "authority and submission comes back to us in pathological forms" through an act of God executed upon an entire culture for the sins of that culture, I see no difference between that and blaming Katrina on homosexuals.

Also, whether it was your intention or not, you're establishing a correlation between rape and sex as you feel God intended it. You're saying that we've replaced authority and submission with fantasies of domination and reluctant submission, and use words with violent connotations, whether you're willing to recognize those connotations or not, to describe the former. Is it any wonder that readers of this blog extrapolate that out to mean that men fantasize of rape because their rapine desires aren't being met at home? Or women wistfully read about rape fantasies because their own sex lives are too consensual? Your and Mr. Wilson's befuddlement at the vitriol being expressed by commenters displays an unwillingness to recognize the inherent implications in your words for anyone who doesn't begin from identical presuppositions.

Thank you for taking the time to read this rather lengthy comment.

 Alastair Roberts

July 18, 2012 at 4:18 am

Rev Wilson, while agreeing with you that much of the sort of imagery that you refer to is quite clearly alluded to in Scripture, especially in such places as the Song of Solomon, I still wonder a couple of things.

First, while these images are poetically allusive, and many of their referents should be quite apparent to the person familiar with biblical imagery, I would be interested to know why you didn't feel the need to qualify and clarify their sense to guard against less charitable interpretations that you might feel that they have been exposed to, or simply to set the minds of people for whom such words have very different connotations at ease. While you might read the concept of 'penetration' in terms of the biblical comparisons of the bride to a city with walls and a guarded door, or an enclosed garden that the bridegroom enters, for many of your readers it will be nothing more than a crude and reductive fixation on one dimension of the physical act of intercourse. While you might see the notion of 'conquest' in terms of one party's breaking down of the other's defences through loving action, much as Christ's overwhelming grace broke down our resistance to him, many of your readers will process such language in terms of common cultural expressions such as 'sexual conquest', expressions that denote something objectifying and uncaring. While you might see the concept of 'colonization' in terms of the woman's walled garden being given up to the man and being spoken of as his to enjoy and to cultivate (**Song 4:12-5:1**), the notion of colonization rings far less pleasantly on the ears of those for whom its primary relation is the callous 'rape' of other cultures by Western nations in previous centuries. While you probably understand the term 'planting' within the rich, expansive and allusive web of biblical imagery, symbolically relating men and women to sowing seed and answering earth, I suspect that many of your readers are unfamiliar with this background. My concern is that, by failing carefully to qualify and clarify such language in a cultural context where such images may land uncomfortably on our ears, you expose yourself to alienating misunderstandings or confusion, which compromise the reception of your message, and you give your message a potentially objectionable cast which provokes dismay and hurt, or easily hands others the cause they desire to take wilful offence. Have you given thought to the way that such language will be heard by a rape survivor, for instance? I suspect that greater sensitivity to such concerns would mollify many who have been offended to an excessive degree and make uncharitable readings less understandable.

Second, the way that you frame the woman's role seems to me to represent a failure to explore the rich poetic biblical imagery that seems to underlie your description of the man's role. The woman seems to be reduced to the mere passive object of the male's action. Now, I am pretty sure that this is not what you mean, but to many this is how your statements will read, and to the extent that you seem to make little attempt to explore the woman's action, I am inclined to share their concerns to a great extent. For instance, the agency of the Shulamite is throughout the Song of Songs, and the beloved says rather a lot about what the Shulamite does to him, things that represent a sort of counterbalance to the action of the man. The Shulamite is an image of great strength, an image that leaves viewers awestruck. She is like a great army with banners (6:4,10), like a glorious tower of strength, or the beauty of Jerusalem. If Solomon penetrates the Shulamite's walls, the Shulamite totally overwhelms him: 'you have ravished my heart with one look of your eyes!' (4:9), 'turn your eyes away from me, for they have overcome me' (6:5), 'the king is held captive by its tresses' (7:5). Solomon may gently conquer the Shulamite with his love, but the Shulamite has already completely overwhelmed him. His 'conquest' is not the victory of superior and secure force, but something that occurs to one who has himself been utterly defeated. In this sense, one could argue that the action is less his 'conquest' and more her free 'surrender': while he is the one awestruck and overwhelmed by her mighty beauty, his victor still surrenders to him (the surprise of this should be marvelous to us). Likewise she is the one who invites the one she has conquered to 'colonize' her garden. The freedom of her invitation is no pallid 'acceptance', 'reception', or 'surrender', but a completely free action, neither determined nor reduced in the fullness of its agency by the action of the man.

There is definitely asymmetry within the biblical depiction of the sexual relationship of marriage and of male and female in general. However, this asymmetry is not of a purely unilateral authority/submission or active/passive character. I believe that a more sensitive and careful reading of the biblical texts will bear this claim of mine out (I am pretty sure that I could match you verse for verse on claims of the man being overcome by the woman next to claims of the man conquering the woman, for instance). The seemingly (I stress, seemingly – I want to attempt to read you charitably here) unilateral character of your vision of free and clear agency in marriage produces a troubling muting of the biblical teaching of women's agency and even authority relative to men (cf. **1 Corinthians 7:4**).

While I disagree with the egalitarians – quite strongly, in fact – I find your views, and those of many other complementarians, no less concerning and sub-biblical on this front, and perhaps even more so given the character of the abuses that it might unwittingly and unintentionally be opening itself up to, especially as they leave themselves exposed to dangerous misunderstandings. Knowing your respect for the Scripture's authority and guidance on this and all other matters, and admiring your commitment to follow it wholeheartedly in a manner that denies all supposed claims of party, cultural sensitivities, or political correctness, I would ask you to explore more carefully what the Scripture has to teach on the subject of female agency, and not merely absolutize one side of the picture. As you well know, such relationships are not a zero-sum game but a spring of life, freedom, and agency for both parties: I believe that it would serve as an encouragement, reassurance, and blessing to many of your hearers were you to sound with a far less uncertain trumpet the implications of this for women. It might also set the minds and keyboards of a number of your strongest critics at greater rest.



Ann

July 17, 2012 at 11:13 pm

Why on earth is this article appearing in "Gospel Coalition"? Where is the oversight. gag!



Ryan

July 17, 2012 at 11:53 pm

Well, now this has been an explosion, hasn't it? Never before have I seen two sides use the word "uncharitable" over and over again to attempt to bludgeon one another into submission.

What troubles me, though, is that Jared, with all due respect, is taking perhaps far more defensive a position than is commendable. In fact, his attitude seems to be more of “Oh no, the Egalitarian Brigade is here! Better smack them down with Proper Theology!”

First, it is evident by the very existence of the comments that the portion posted could have benefited from a bit more explanation than a mere opening paragraph. Perhaps a bit of elaboration? Some commentary? Even those who are inclined to read the quoted text as charitably as possible would likely have benefited from such an approach.

Second, the claims that this would be easily understood by regular readers don't really make any sense. Isn't the entire purpose of the Internet blog that it has the potential to reach thousands of people who aren't regular readers? As such, simply saying “Well if you knew my blog, you'd get it” doesn't really seem to be sufficient as the very purpose of blogging in general is to reach people who aren't familiar with it whatsoever.

Third, I realize that the attack here has been heavy and constant, but why so controlling? Why are any questions of Doug Wilson's theology such a terrible thing? I realize no one likes to have one of their favourite texts ripped apart by someone who disagrees with them, and now the man himself is here as a part of it, but there does seem to be an underlying tone of absolute intolerance for conflicting view points (from both sides, mind you).

Fourth, Jared, you have to realize that this text is very polemic in nature, and takes quite a few pot shots at egalitarian theology (and perhaps even goes to a level of patriarchy that some complementarians would be uncomfortable with). Even were its message, then, to be above reproach (a matter which I'll not comment on for now), the language it uses is certainly designed to provoke a reaction. That reaction is what happened. Can you really complain about that?



Sarah aka @MainlineMom

July 17, 2012 at 11:54 pm

Jared, I love you, I normally love your writing, and I am a regular reader here at TGC. I did not come from whatever other blog you are saying all these other people came from. And I am NOT an egalitarian either. I also happen to have excellent reading comprehension skills, I promise you.

I understand the point. I understand Doug Wilson's point of view, mostly due to your comments underneath the post, NOT from the actual exert itself. I found the exert to be horrifying, sickening and offensive. The language used is important, words are important. I really think other commenters here have done an adequate job of explaining WHY it is so disturbing, so I won't rehash that.

I'm mostly chalking this up to you being male and simply not being able to see this from a woman's point of view.



Shanon

July 18, 2012 at 12:10 am

I'm not sure what the hub-bub is about. Taking poetic license in describing the nature of sexual relationships seems to have skimmed the heads of many of the readers by twisting things out of context on the part of the commentors. Sure, the illustration may have been graphic, but if the reader would set down the post-Sexual Revolution glasses and re-read the excerpt, they might stop speaking in offended cliché's.



jmw

July 18, 2012 at 12:23 am

Dear James,

Feed my sheep (instead of stealing their precious time with vacuous blogging that serves no purpose except to create controversy in order to boost your ego).

- Jesus



50 Shades of Douglas Wilson's Racism and the Gospel Coalition @TGC |

July 18, 2012 at 12:37 am

[...] marbles, look no further than a post that basically PRAISES Fifty Shades of Gray by E.L. James. The Gospel Coalition: The Polluted Waters of 50 Shades of Grey According to Reformed “theologian” Doug [...]



Vrob125

July 18, 2012 at 12:47 am

Show me a racist, and I will show you a sexist. Confirmed in this case, I think.



Scottie

July 18, 2012 at 1:20 am

I'll go out on a limb here —

but I don't think the Mr. Wilsons have ever been raped. So they get a shred of a pass on their apparent bewilderment as to the responses here.

But as for the collective empathy of a small cauliflower between the 2 of them? The seeming total lack of awareness of the effect these words have on someone who may have been raped? The lack of imagination as to what this is like to read??

Either relational ignoramuses or cold calculated passive aggressors. Whichever, they appear to breath rarified air, inhaling deeply.



Brindusa

July 18, 2012 at 2:16 am

How in the world can “the sexual act cannot be made into an egalitarian pleasuring party” be explained away so that it would *not* mean that sex inherently is not or is not meant to be pleasurable for both the man and the woman? (My husband would strongly disagree – for him it’s pleasurable if I feel loved and find pleasure as well.) How can you make that quote mean something other than what it plainly says?



Me

July 18, 2012 at 5:48 am

With the apparent “misunderstanding” of Doug Wilson’s book, and *people’s unwillingness* to read it in context...he now knows what it is like to be Rob Bell!



Victorious

July 18, 2012 at 7:07 am

Jared said:

...”. * If you had, you’d know Wilson’s care for women is profound. The entire book is about how men are designed to protect and lead women with tenderness.”

Oh PULEEZE!! That’s a kind of tenderness women can (and will) do without!

Mary Ann



Abram K-J

July 18, 2012 at 7:28 am

I agree with everything Ryan said above about the process of replying to these comments. Thank you, Ryan, and well said.

This, of course, is the most difficult part of the initial quote:

“In other words, however we try, the sexual act cannot be made into an egalitarian pleasuring party. A man penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants. A woman receives, surrenders, accepts.”

A key concept of discourse analysis (Steve Runge talks about this with reference to the Greek New Testament) is that “choice implies meaning.” So instead of the Biblical Hebrew “goes into,” Wilson chose “penetrates.” Instead of “establishes/builds,” he chose “colonizes,” etc. It’s his prerogative as an author to choose those words, whether one likes them or not.

The problem is, each of those words has meanings associated with them, whether we want them to or not. This is true whether or not a word *should* mean a certain thing. (I’m thinking of Jared’s, “It is difficult to understand, I’m sure, when they are defined with violence in mind. In this isolated passage Wilson has ruled that out.”)

I don’t agree that Wilson has sufficiently ruled that out (that last paragraph when he speaks against “devours” is too short to do that, but maybe the rest of Wilson’s work does?). But even if he has ruled out violence, his *choice* to use especially *colonizes* is confusing. As the immense and growing field of post-colonial literature attests, colonization has left untold trauma in its wake. And, yes, colonization was all too often violent. Rape often occurred as part of colonization, so that choice of word (remember, choice implies meaning) in this context (speaking about rape—even if against it) was particularly surprising and probably did not help the author’s case at all.

Also, Wilson’s saying “the sexual act cannot be made into an egalitarian pleasuring party” is just bizarre. Besides seeming like an unwarranted barb against egalitarians, what seems to be implied (with that sentence contextualizing the next two) is that there is no way (“cannot”) for *both* parties (“egalitarian”) to be *pleasured* (“pleasuring party”) all the time, since one is busy “penetrat[ing]” (with pleasure) and the other (merely) “receives” and “surrenders” (implied: even if she doesn’t receive pleasure from it?). You can see how it’s not a far leap in the reader’s mind from there to rape imagery, whether Wilson means this or not. I’m certainly not accusing him of anything. But it was, at best, a bad choice of words.

Is it egalitarianism that he is speaking against? Or is it against the idea of man and woman both having pleasure in sex? In other words, would Wilson approve of a “complementarian pleasuring party where the man penetrates and the woman receives, both receive pleasure, and if one does not, per [I Cor 7:4-5](#), both stop out of mutual love for each other?” I’d assume he would, based on these comments above.

But “surrenders” in this context, especially when used unidirectionally and paired with “colonizes”—IF Wilson means to apply them specifically to the sex act, which it seems he does—is an unfortunate choice of words. If/when there is any “surrendering” in sex, it goes both ways, as the apostle Paul points out. (I know Paul is talking about *not* having sex, but his larger principle from [I Cor 7:4](#) surely applies to having sex, too.) Neither has authority over his/her own body, but yields it to the other. “Colonizes” and “surrenders” is pretty difficult to square with this.



Sex as colonization? | Words on the Word

July 18, 2012 at 7:51 am

[...] morning I followed a friend’s Facebook link to a Gospel Coalition blog post. Here is the post I read. It’s hard to summarize, but the basic topic is the “good, [...]



Jared C. Wilson

July 18, 2012 at 8:37 am

Well, folks, since the ability to say anything new has passed its use by date, I’m going to go ahead and close the comments.

But you may still let me know how you feel about this post, Doug Wilson, or me via email jared AT gospeldrivenchurch DOT com

I will publish a follow-up post on the blog later today. Thanks for all your comments.

 **Let's just call it what it is – rape | Unsettled Christianity** July 18, 2012 at 12:23 pm

[...] Gospel Coalition is promoting Doug Wilson's take on take, When we quarrel with the way the world is, we find [...]

 **Take it Down** July 18, 2012 at 12:37 pm

[...] Gary Wills on Political Purity Take it Down July 18, 2012 By scotmcknight 1 Comment I am calling on The Gospel Coalition to remove its post by Jared Wilson. It's mostly a quotation from Douglas Wilson, but the [...]

 **An Open Letter to the Gospel Coalition « Matr of Fact: On Seeking the Truth in Time** July 18, 2012 at 12:40 pm

[...] the ensuing controversy about it. The post entitled The Polluted Waters of 50 Shades can be found here. The teeming mass of public reaction can be found here. An excellent post speaking out against this [...]

 **If This is What Christian Sex Is Like, No Thank You** July 18, 2012 at 1:09 pm

[...] for the worst review of 50 Shades of Grey ever written, I would read Jared Wilson's at The Gospel Coalition. All he does is reference a passage from a Christian book by Douglas Wilson about how [...]

 **Another geeky theological debate... this one about SEX. | ToddRhoades.com** July 18, 2012 at 1:58 pm

[...] admit... this post by Jared Wilson did stand out to me. In a blog post entitled "The Polluted Waters of 50 Shades of Grey, etc.", Wilson quotes a book from Douglas Wilson: A final aspect of rape that should be briefly [...]

 **Doug Wilson, The Gospel Coalition, and Sanctified Rape Culture | Are Women Human?** July 18, 2012 at 2:11 pm

[...] quote is part of an excerpt posted by Jared Wilson (no relation as far as I know) to The Gospel Coalition blog, with an approving note that explains the popularity of 50 Shades of Grey and "other modern [...]

 **Rachel Held Evans on the Gospel Coalition, sex, and subordination « GeorgePWood.com** July 18, 2012 at 2:45 pm

[...] Posted: July 18, 2012 in Uncategorized o Rachel Held Evans posts a hard-hitting critique of this article on TGC's website: Now in the past, I've always made a distinction between the [...]

 **The Underlying Problem With The Gospel Coalition | The American Jesus** July 18, 2012 at 4:49 pm

[...] Gospel Coalition member Jared Wilson has created quite the stir today with this post about male and female roles in human sexuality. [...]

 **Gender Roles, Submission, and the Image of God: Choose your words carefully « Boundless Treasures** July 18, 2012 at 5:07 pm

[...] July 18, 2012 by Bekah Mason The last few days have seen a small explosion occur online related to a post by Jared C. Wilson on The Gospel Coalition blog site. In what was intended to be a statement against the increasingly popular discussion concerning the sexual practices of bondage and domination that have been poorly represented in works like 50 Shades of Grey, Jared used a quote from a book by Douglas Wilson that was published more than a decade ago. D. Wilson is well known for arguing positions to their logical, and sometimes controversial, end, and he has received a lot of heat for it. You can read Jared's post, Doug's quote and the ensuing heated debate here. [...]

 **50 Shades of WHAT: My response : ♡ MATTHEW PAUL TURNER ♡** July 18, 2012 at 7:09 pm

[...] And it did. Here. By Jared C, Wilson. [...]

 **My one question for Doug Wilson « Mercy not Sacrifice** July 18, 2012 at 7:23 pm

[...] Christian blogosphere has been on fire after a recent blog post by Jared Wilson critiquing the rape porn of 50 Shades of Grey from a Calvinist complementarian [...]

 **Douglas Wilson: Colonial Hero « anthonybsusan** July 18, 2012 at 8:13 pm

[...] then let me make my peace with it. And that works most of the time. Until I read something like this post from Jared Wilson of the Gospel Coalition, and I remember the rage and the pain and futility of [...]

-  **Sex is What I do WITH My Wife, Not TO My Wife**

July 18, 2012 at 8:14 pm

[...] 2012 By Michael F. Bird [Leave a Comment](#)What is gaining notoriety around the blogosphere is a TGC post by Jared Wilson which gives an extensive quote from Doug Wilson about rape and sexual pathology. [...]
-  **Wilson on Woman - A.T. Ross**

July 18, 2012 at 11:43 pm

[...] a quotation from his book Fidelity, used by Gospel Coalition Jared Wilson (no relation) to try and combat this silly 50 Shades of Grey [...]
-  **Shooting straight. lets talk about sex. « Trinitarian Dance**

July 18, 2012 at 11:51 pm

[...] Even more disturbing, I go through my blog reading list this morning, and find the internet is ablaze about this book within Christian circles. What is causing the uproar, is not the book its-self; instead its about a blog post on the Gospel Coalitions website by Jared Wilson. [...]
-  **Sex, Submission, and Evangelicals: Doug Wilson's Controversial Words - Mere Orthodoxy | Christianity, Politics, and Culture**

July 19, 2012 at 7:48 am

[...] to critique Fifty Shades of Grey, a book that I have no plans to read ever. But the bit he excerpted from Doug Wilson to make his point was, to put it mildly, not well received. The main offending part: A man penetrates, conquers, colonizes, plants. A woman receives, [...]

Comments are closed.

